

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request that the instant claim amendments and below remarks be considered in connection with the accompanying Request for Continued Examination (RCE). Claims 1-39 are pending in the application. Claims 1- 33 are allowed. Claims 36-39 are newly added. Claims 1, 7, 18, 19 and 26 are hereby amended.

Applicants appreciate the previous allowance of claims 1-33, and, as further explained herein, Applicants believe that the amendments made herein to claims 1, 7, 18, 19, and 26 do not change the patentability of any of the instant claims.

Independent claim 1 and 7 and dependent claims 18 and 19 all were amended to eliminate the limitation that the respective controller (of each claim) be operable to or capable to *“provide a time-shared mode of operation to provide power sequentially to on or more of the plurality of subsystems.”* Instead, this limitation has been moved to corresponding, newly added dependent claims 36, 37, 38, and 39, which depend, respectively, from claims 1, 7, 18, and 19.

Applicants note that the aforementioned limitation that the controller be operable or capable to *“provide a time-shared mode of operation to provide power sequentially to on or more of the plurality of subsystems”* was not a limitation that was part of any of the claims as filed, and is, in fact part of only certain embodiments of the invention, not all embodiments of the invention. This limitation had previously been added in the response to the first office action (dated March 13, 2006) of the instant application, but it was never the subject of any further rejections or arguments during the remainder of the prosecution up to the notice of allowance dated 4/20/2010. Furthermore, other amendments made to the claims during the prosecution of the application after the response to the first office action clearly show that the invention as recited in claims 1-33 is patentable over the art of record, at least because of the other limitations in the claims.

For example, in the case of independent claims 1 and 7 these claims (and all claims dependent therefrom) are patentable over the art of record at least because of the arguments previously made in the office action response filed May 27, 2009, which explain further why none of the art of record, taken individually or in any combination, teaches or suggests their limitations of:

a plurality of power source regulated buses, each respective power source regulated bus *originating at a common power source and terminating at a respective one of k load subsystems*, each respective power source regulated bus directly coupling only the common power source and the respective one of the k load subsystems without coupling to any other of the k load subsystems;

for each respective one of the k load subsystems, *a plurality of direct independent electrical interconnections between the respective one of the k load subsystems and each other one of the k load subsystems*, each direct independent electrical interconnection comprising one or more conductors, *wherein each direct independent electrical interconnection originates at the respective one of the k load subsystems and terminates at one other of the k load subsystems without coupling to any other of the k load subsystems, such that there is no more than a single direct independent electrical interconnection between any two of the k load subsystems* and such that the total number of the plurality of direct independent electrical interconnections between all of the k load subsystems comprises no more than $k * [(k-1)/2]$ direct, independent electrical interconnections;

Thus, independent claims 1 and 7 already were found to be patentable at least because of (1) these above limitations, in combination with other claim limitations, and (2) the reasons given by the Examiner in the Notice of Allowance of 4/20/2010, as well as in the Final Office Action of 1/7/2010 (in which reasons for the allowability of claims 1-14 and 33 were provided). None of the limitations noted above or reasons given relate wholly or partially to the limitation that the controller has a time-shared mode of operation to provide power sequentially to one or more of the plurality of subsystems. Accordingly, this limitation has been deleted from claims 1 and 7 and moved to newly added dependent claims 36 and 37, which depend, respectively, from patentable claims 1 and 7. Because these newly added depend claims depend from claims that

are allowable over the art of record, these newly added dependent claims (together with all other claims depending from claims 1 and 7, namely claims 1-14) likewise should be allowable.

Previously allowed claim 26 (which depends from amended claim 15) was amended to correct a typographical error, wherein it originally erroneously recited “a third group of at least one switch, each of said second group of at least one switch coupling a respective stabilizer...”, where the “second” should properly have been “third” (to refer to the recited “third group”). This error has been corrected.

Previously allowed independent claim 15 does not include a controller and thus was not amended, although two of its dependent claims, namely claims 18 and 19 (each of which recites a controller) have been amended to move the aforementioned controller limitation to newly added dependent claims 38 and 39. Because claims 18, 19, 38, and 39 depend from allowed claim 15, these amended claims likewise should be allowable. Applicants also maintain that all previously-allowed claims depending from allowed claim 15 (namely, claims 16-32) should remain allowable.

The Applicants do not acquiesce to any assertions made by the Examiner not explicitly addressed herein.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigning attorney if there are any questions regarding this Response or this application.

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500845, including but not limited to, any charges for extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 10, 2010

DALY, CROWLEY, MOFFORD & DURKEE, LLP

By: /Marianne M. Downing/
Marianne M. Downing
Reg. No. 42,870
Attorney for Applicant(s)
354A Turnpike Street - Suite 301A
Canton, MA 02021-2714
Tel.: (781) 401-9988, Ext. 122
Fax: (781) 401-9966
mmd@dc-m.com